

HOW THE MACDONALD BY-ELECTION WAS WON

READ

THE AFFIDAVITS SHOWING THE
OUTRAGES COMMITTED BY
POLICE AND MAGISTRATES
UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE
ROGERS-ROBLIN COMBINATION

PUBLICATION NO. 3.

ISSUED BY
CENTRAL INFORMATION OFFICE
OF THE
CANADIAN LIBERAL PARTY
OTTAWA, CANADA

FE 53-4

99

25

c. 2

}

Not since Confederation have the people of Canada been so rudely shocked as at the disclosures regarding the methods by which the Macdonald by-election was won by the Tories. Though the people unfortunately are often indifferent to electoral corruption in heated contests it has been the peculiar pride of Canadians for years that, no matter what politicians might do, at least their courts and administration of justice were inviolate, without fear or reproach, and independent of any outside influence. Now in Manitoba, at least, the combined efforts of the Tory governments of the Dominion and that Province have shattered this faith.

It will be remembered that owing to the appointment of Mr. Staples to the Dominion Grain Commission the constituency of Macdonald was left vacant. The Federal Government fixed October 12th as the date of the bye-election to fill this vacancy. Mr. Alexander Morrison was the Conservative Candidate and was opposed by Mr. R. L. Richardson as independent, who was supported by the Grain Growers Association and Liberals.

OFFICERS OF JUSTICE FURTHER PARTY ENDS.

To the surprise and indignation of the public it has been established beyond cavil that in this by-election which resulted in the return of Mr. Morrison, officers of the law and even magistrates and officials of the courts joined in partisan work against Mr. Richardson. This official partisanship took the form not merely of falsely arresting Liberal workers, but of actually kidnapping them under forms of law, spiriting them around from one part of the country to another so as to keep them from rescue by their friends; refusing some of them bail under trumped up charges for which the law contemplated bail; and the issuing of blank warrants, to be filled up at the discretion of Conservative workers. One man was actually arrested under a warrant issued two days before his alleged offence. But this is not all,—ill-treating and ill-feeding men so unjustly arrested; refusing them access to their lawyers, and even denying them knowledge of the specific charges under which they were arrested; criminally altering private documents so as to make an apparent ground for charges of bribery, and with these forgeries and threats endeavoring to bully

prisoners into confessing to crimes they had not committed, with premises of freedom if they would make such false confession, and threats of conviction by perjured evidence if they refused,—these and many more are the indictments brought by four victims against certain detectives, police, magistrates and courts of Manitoba under the Roblin-Rogers influence.

These outrages so resemble the Star Chamber methods of King Charles in the 17th century, the days of the Bastile in France, and Russian despotism that it is hard to believe such things could have been perpetrated in Canada in 1912. Yet these charges against the administration of justice are made and supported with affidavits by the men who suffered from the Roblin-Rogers tyranny. Four men, D. H. Walkirshaw, R. J. A. Prince, J. J. Sullivan and W. B. Sifton, all Liberal workers, engaged in electioneering in Macdonald were arrested during the contest, and the ill-treatment to which they were subjected is described in their affidavits: they were released without real charge or trial as soon as the election was over.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT MOLESTED.

And not only are the charges backed by the solemn affidavits of the men who suffered from this extraordinary conspiracy between Conservative workers and the courts to defeat the ends of justice, but are substantiated by the word of two respected members of Parliament, Messrs. L. J. Gauthier, M.P., (St. Hyacinthe), and Lieut. Col. Gustave Boyer, M.P. (Vaudreuil), speaking with full responsibility as members of Parliament.

Mr. Gauthier who is not only member of Parliament but King's Counsel and a leading member of the Quebec Bar, since Parliament opened, stated from his seat in the House of Commons on November 26 that while campaigning in Macdonald he had been shadowed for eleven days by detectives; the key of his room stolen, his grip searched and his room ransacked, while Manitoba Provincial detectives, wearing their badges, had tried to get a man at Notre Dame de Lourdes drunk and then attempted to bribe this man to sign a complaint so that the detectives might arrest him (Mr. Gauthier.)

On the same evening (Nov. 26.) Lieut. Col. Gustave Boyer, an officer in the King's Militia and M. P. for Vaudreuil, said in Parliament that he also had campaigned in Macdonald. On arriving there he had heard of the infamous conduct of the agents of the Rogers-Roblin combination and had refused to believe what he heard. "I have," said he, "taken part in many heated contests, but I have never witnessed before in the Conservative party such an utter con-

tempt for the electoral law, and an inquiry before the committee on privileges and elections will bring this to light."

Lieut. Col. Boyer declared that one afternoon an officer informed him that he was to be arrested within a quarter of an hour. He demanded why and was told it was because he was going to address an audience that evening against a friend of Mr. Morrison's. And the person who brought him this word stated he had overheard a telephone conversation between a Government employee and a supporter of Mr. Morrison when the latter had been instructed to repair to a certain District Magistrate and secure a number of blank summonses. Lieut. Col. Boyer said he had not been alarmed and had continued his work as had many other Liberal workers who had been similarly threatened with arrest and persecution.

In addition to these statements of actual experiences, on the same evening in Parliament Mr. O. Turgeon, Member for Gloucester, stated that his son, a youth still studying law, had been engaged in the Macdonald election. His son had written to him to the following effect. "When I read in the papers all the reports of the arrests made without evidence I only believed half of it, but I was scarcely in the County until I had myself a policeman at my heels. Naturally as I was doing nothing wrong or illegal I did not fear him. Notwithstanding on the eve of the election I was notified by this gentleman of the police that if I did not cease to speak to the people in favour of Reciprocity I should be arrested and imprisoned. I asked him what was his charge. He replied "I have none, but I have my instructions. Naturally I told him that I could not follow his advice, that I had come to work and intended to work. At this moment a few good Frenchmen came along and my gentleman of the police soon abandoned the idea of arresting me."

CHARGES PROVEN BY AFFIDAVITS.

As to the criminal work in Macdonald the affidavits of the four victims are explicit. They are given in such form that if untrue they would render the parties who have made them not merely liable to civil actions in damages for libel, but also to criminal proceedings for perjury. Already civil actions have been taken by three of the victims of these outrages against the officers and magistrates concerned in their arrest and detention. D. H. Walkinshaw and R. J. A. Prince have taken action for \$3,000 each, and W. B. Sifton, whose case was even more glaring has entered action for \$10,000.

The affidavits speak for themselves, and the facts they disclose demand the attention of all interested in preserving individual freedom in Canada, as well as the proper conduct of elections:—

Arrested and Jailed Without Cause---Government Drops Case and Prisoner Honorably Discharged.

AFFIDAVIT OF MR. WALKINSHAW.

Dominion of Canada.

Province of Manitoba.

In the matter of the arrest of D. H. Walkinshaw at Rathwell, Manitoba, by the Manitoba Provincial Police, in pursuance of a warrant signed by one Chad, on October 9, 1912.

To wit:

I, Donald H. Walkinshaw, of the City of Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba, Agent, do solemnly declare that.

1. That hereto attached and marked Exhibit 'A' to this declaration, and signed by me, is a statement setting forth the circumstances in connection with said arrest.

2. That all allegations contained in said statement are true in substance and in fact.

And I make this solemn Declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the "Canada Evidence Act."

Declared before me at the City of Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba this 2nd day of November, A.D., 1912, J. A. Wilton.

A Notary Public in and for Manitoba.

DONALD H. WALKINSHAW.

This is Exhibit 'A' referred to in the declaration of D. H. Walkinshaw hereto attached declared before me this 2nd day of November A.D., 1912.

J. A. WILTON. Notary Public

I was born in Toronto twenty-six years ago but have spent the last seven years up in Temiskaming Ontario, where I was engaged in business on my own behalf, and always took an active part in the work of the Liberal Party in that district. Just previous to my going West in the middle of last September, I undertook to help in the organization, and the correction of the voters' list in the Province of Ontario, under the supervision of Mr. Inwood, the Provincial Secretary of the Liberal Association. This work being completed, I came out to the West with the idea of

getting into business at Winnipeg, and naturally in the course of a few days identified myself in the Liberal Executive headquarters, where I was told of the by-election which would be contested in a few weeks in the constituency of McDonald. Mr. Richardson, who was the independent candidate, and making his platform that of reciprocity and wider market, invited me to take part, and not being particularly busy at the time, I volunteered my services. I did not ask for any remuneration, and instead of being a "hired tool" of the party as our opponents claim, I am as a matter of fact out of pocket, as a result of my zeal in the cause.

On Monday, September 30th, I went down to Rathwell to look after the organization in that district. In company with Adam Forbes, a merchant of the town, I canvassed electors from day to day with very fair success, in fact so much so that I aroused the resentment of the other party. Although there were two or three outside conservative workers hanging around in Rathwell, I could not find that they were making much effort to canvass the voters, but were evidently spreading stories about my work, and impugning my motives, with the idea of discrediting me. I was however, always treated most courteously by the farmers, with whom I came in contact, and given a fair hearing for my story, and I am still firmly of the opinion that the majority of the farmers really believe that freer trade relations with Great Britain and also with the United States, would be in the interest of the West, and would gladly lend their support were it not for the sinister influences brought to bear by the Roblin-Rogers combination.

The day I was arrested, October 9th, I spent canvassing in the neighborhood of Indian Ford, north of Rathwell, and on my return to Rathwell about 6 o'clock, I found a provincial policeman in the hotel. He didn't however, attempt to molest me until after I had had my supper. He called me into another room as I came out of the dining-room, and after asking me if I were Mr. Walkinshaw, said he had a warrant for my arrest. The constable's name was A. C. Ross. I asked him if he intended to serve it, and he said he certainly did. I then demanded to see the warrant and he protested that it was not necessary to show it to me. However, on my insisting, he took me to his room, accompanied by two assistants, and showed me the warrant which was sworn before Paul Kane, justice of the peace in Rathwell, and the information was laid by C. Chad, of St. James.

The information stated that I was charged with violating section 269 of the Dominion Election Act, and on my asking what

specific charge was laid against me, he told me I would find out soon enough. On my questioning his right to serve a warrant on such a vague charge, he told me he had nothing to do with the matter, but was told to serve the warrant, and hoped I would go along peaceably. Ross then searched me, took my papers, money, watch, and in fact everything he found on my person. He also took charge of my grip, and on my asking to be allowed to settle my hotel bill, he instructed one of his assistants to find out the amount. This was handed over and a receipt secured from the hotel keeper for me.

Ross then took me by the arm and walked me down to the station, and sat with me in the station waiting room until the train arrived some half an hour later. He was very officious in his manner and spoke offensively to several of my friends who were interested in what was going on, ordering them away, and asking that any remarks be addressed to him. He and one of his assistants then accompanied me on the train to Winnipeg.

On reaching Winnipeg, J. W. Wilton, who is a solicitor, attempted to give me some suggestions and legal advice, but was ordered by the detective to keep away under threat that he would fix him. I was then hurried into a waiting automobile, and rushed to the Provincial Jail, where arrangements had been made to receive me. On being entered I was again searched and then the detective handed over my effects to the jail authorities, and I gave a receipt for the same on being asked for it. I then asked to be allowed to communicate with my counsel, but was told that I could not do so, as it was after 11 o'clock. They then took me into the ward, and I was ordered to get undressed and leave my clothes in a bench in the aisle. After doing so, I was locked in a cell and left for the night.

At 6 o'clock in the morning a gong rang and I was roughly ordered to "hurry and get up now." My door was unlocked and I got my clothes and dressed. All the others had prison suits, and these suits along with my clothes lay together in the aisle outside the cells. The cells were then locked again and a man came through with a tin of porridge without any milk, a portion of dry bread, and a tin cup of tea without sugar or milk. These were poked through a hole in the cage, and constituted the regular prison breakfast. Not being used to this kind of fare however, I found it impossible to force myself to eat it. After a short while another warder or turnkey came to me and took me into another ward and locked me in a cell there. He said it would be quieter.

I was left there till about twenty minutes to ten and was then taken to the office, where my solicitor, Mr. McMurray was waiting to see me. But I had hardly shaken hands with him when I was taken out of the office into another room, where I was weighed and measured and particulars of my personal appearance taken down in the prison records. They quizzed me as to my name, address, age and record, asking me if I had ever been in prison before.

I was then handed over to a Provincial Detective who took me out of the building, and as I was leaving I asked if I was not to be allowed to see my solicitor. The man only said he had his orders. A taxicab was waiting for us outside. My solicitor attempted to get in and ride down with us to our destination, but was ordered away by the detective. He has since told me that the official in charge of the provincial jail informed him that he might ride in the cab with me, but this was evidently done to put him off, as he was refused permission when he attempted it. I was then rushed to the C.N.R. depot and on to the train for Portage. I was not informed however, of my destination until I was getting on the train.

On arriving at Portage, the detective took me straight to the provincial jail, where on his telling them who I was, they said they were expecting me. After being entered I was taken into the common ward and locked in a cell until after dinner. Dinner in this jail consisted of a thin, greasy soup, one baked potato, dry bread and a tin cup of rank tea without sugar or milk.

After dinner I was taken to the Police Court and was brought up before Magistrate Marshall, in what looked to me like a secret session, as the only persons present were the magistrate, the prosecuting attorney, the detective who brought me and a local police officer. The charge was then read by the magistrate, and it was found to be just the same vague charge as was set forth in the warrant under Section 269. The Crown prosecutor, F. J. G. Taylor, then stated that as the documents relating to the charge were not in his possession, he would ask the Court to remand the case until Saturday afternoon, October 12, in order that they might get their case prepared.

The magistrate was about to close the matter in this way, when I took the matter in my own hands, and addressing the court, asked the magistrate if he intended to commit me without any definite charge being laid. As he did not make any comment, I asked that I be admitted to bail. Turning to the Crown prosecutor, Mr. Taylor, he asked him what he thought of that. Mr.

Taylor replied that although they were not there that day to try the case, in view of the fact that the prisoner was not represented by counsel, the information which he had was of too serious a nature to permit of bail. Without further comment, Magistrate Marshall committed me to the jail till Saturday, October 12, two o'clock in the afternoon.

I was then taken back to the provincial jail by the detective, and on being turned over to the prison officials was locked up in a cell just like a common criminal and was subjected to exactly the same treatment with regard to meals, sleeping accommodation and confinement as I had been previously. On returning to the jail I demanded to be allowed to get into communication with my solicitor, and I was permitted to call him up on the phone. After being locked up in the cell for some time, I was taken into the office and allowed a few minutes private conversation with my solicitor. He stated that he would see what he could do about bail, although he was afraid there was not much chance of doing anything in view of the attitude of the people pressing the prosecution.

I didn't see my solicitor again until a few minutes before the time to go to the court house on Saturday afternoon, when he informed me that he had so far been unable to do anything with them in the matter of bail, but that he hoped to be allowed to get me out on bail after the hearing that afternoon. I was taken over to the police court by one of the prison officials and the case was again called. After this Mr. Taylor, the Crown prosecutor, read a telegram from the head of the provincial police asking for a further remand till Wednesday or Thursday of the following week in order to enable them to have their witnesses present. This was granted by the court.

My counsel then asked that a special charge be laid or be made, and objected strongly to the vague wording of the information that had been submitted. Mr. Taylor, Crown prosecutor, then stated that the documents in connection with the case had not been forwarded to him, and that he didn't know any more about the case than was contained in the warrant. Now, Mr. Taylor had stated at the hearing on the previous Thursday that the case was too serious a one to allow the prisoner to be admitted to bail. My solicitor then demanded that bail be allowed and after consultation with the Crown prosecutor the magistrate fixed the bail at two sureties of \$1,000 each, and one personal surety of \$2,000, or altogether \$4,000.

As we were not prepared at the time to produce this bail,

I was again taken back to the provincial jail and kept there till 8 o'clock on Saturday evening. In the meantime I had been given my supper and had gone to bed in the ordinary prison routine. At a few minutes to eight one of the jail officials came in and told me to get up and dress, as they were going to take me over to the court house, where my bail would be arranged. After dressing I proceeded in his company to the court house where bail was arranged by my friends in the town. I then proceeded to the hotel and the following morning came back to Winnipeg.

On the Thursday following, that is to-day, my solicitor, Mr. McMurray, got into communication with Mr. Taylor, the Crown prosecutor, asking him to bring the matter up at once in order to have it disposed of as soon as possible, and Mr. Taylor, after telephoning to the authorities in Winnipeg, and asking them whether they intended to go on with the case, acceded to Mr. McMurray's request. In the absence of Magistrate Marshall, Mayor Garland occupied the bench. The Crown prosecutor asked that the case be dismissed, as he had no evidence to submit. My solicitor immediately asked for and received a certificate of discharge.

I did not then, or have I since been able to find out, what the nature of the charge against me was. The man Chad, who laid the information, stated that he was an official of the police department, but they have denied any knowledge of him at all, and so far we have been unable to find any trace of him in the country, and the matter has been treated by the police officers and opposition papers as a political joke, and something against which I should have no right to complain.

(Sgd.) D. H. WALKINSHAW.

That is to say, a man was held under \$4,000 bail against whom there was not a shred or a tittle of evidence to warrant his arrest, much less his detention in jail. All that Mr. Walkinshaw was guilty of was the exercise of the right of free speech; he suffered for that by deprivation of his personal liberty.

Arrested and Jailed Without Cause---Offered His Freedom on Condition of Perjury.

AFFIDAVIT OF R. J. A. PRINCE.

Province of Manitoba,
Dominion of Canada,
To wit:

In the matter of the arrest of Rosario J. A. Prince, prior to the election held in the Electoral Division of Macdonald, on October 12, 1912, which arrest took place on the 11th day of October, A.D. 1912.

I, Rosario J. A. Prince, of the city of St. Boniface, in the Province of Manitoba, student-at-law, do solemnly declare that:

1. That I am the Rosario J. A. Prince who was arrested on the date above mentioned.
2. That hereto attached and marked Exhibit 'A' to this my declaration is a document containing all the circumstances connected with said arrest.
3. That all the statements contained in said document are true in substance and in fact.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the 'Canada Evidence Act.'

Declared before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 6th day of November, A.D. 1912.

J. W. Wilton,

A notary public in and for Manitoba.

R. J. A. PRINCE.

In the matter of the arrest of R. J. A. Prince.

This is Exhibit 'A' referred to in the declaration of Rosario J. A. Prince, sworn before me at Winnipeg this 6th day of November, 1912.

J. W. Wilton,
A notary public in and for Manitoba.

I went down to Cardinal on Monday, October 7th, to take part in the elections. On Tuesday the day following, October 8th, I drove up to Notre Dame de Lourdes along with Cyril Rozier to

prepare for a meeting which we were to hold there that evening. On our arrival there, we stopped at the boarding house kept by Paul Fries. We had our dinner there, and left without paying for it, and drove further into the country. We returned later and prepared the hall for the meeting, and then had supper at Paul Fries' house. After supper we went to pay for the meals, and I had no change less than \$10. Rozier paid for the meals. Later on in the evening when we were leaving, we had the horses harnessed up outside, and as we were going I paid Fries for the stabling. He had no change with him, and went into the house for it. I said jokingly to him, 'Don't say I gave you that to keep you from voting.' He came back in a few minutes with the change, giving me \$9.50. A man by the name of Laboret was with me when Fries gave me back the change.

We returned to Cardinal that night, and I continued my work there. I knew that I was watched all the time. There were detectives in the hotel at Cardinal all the week, and they were watching all that was going on. Many times during the week I was told by different parties that I would be arrested. Finally on Thursday night, after the Conservative meeting held by A. Potvin at Lourdes, at which Mr. Gauthier spoke for us, I was once more admonished by Paul Fries in his stable, that I would be arrested the next day. Fries told me that one Dixon wanted him to appear against me, pretending that I had given him (Fries) money. To this I answered that I did not care, and that they could not arrest me, because I had done nothing wrong.

Fries insisted, saying 'I want to tell you that Dixon wants to have you arrested, and wants me to appear as witness.' I said 'My dear man I don't know you.' Then he said, 'If you are arrested call me up, and I will come to help you out.'

I get back to Cardinal that night, and acted as if nothing was stirring against me, but I had an idea that I could not clear up, as Fries' words and actions were strange to me. At last on Friday morning, I was called aside by Frank Chittick, and he asked me to go to his room. He then said I was under arrest, and as I protested and would not go into his room, he finally showed a warrant which had been made out against me. I read the warrant which had been signed by two justices of the peace. One appeared to me like the signature of one Defromant, and the other was Louis Fouasse. The name of Defromant was struck off, and Mr. Fouasse appeared to have taken the oath. This indicated to me that the warrant was possibly sworn in blank.

Soon after my arrest, I was joined by A. C. Ross, provincial

detective, bringing a man by the name of Frank Turcot. Then I tried to phone to Winnipeg to tell the executive of my arrest, but Ross snatched me away from the phone. A few minutes after the phone rang, and some one called for me. I was allowed to go and answer the message, possibly because they thought that I could not do anything more. It was the executive that was calling me up, and I told them of my arrest. I then asked Ross where he was going to take me to, and he said to Winnipeg, so I told the executive that I was coming to Winnipeg. Here I was maliciously deceived, as I was taken to Morden by Detective A. C. Ross, who failed to keep his word, as he could have taken me down to Winnipeg more easily than to Morden, as the train was coming from the west to Winnipeg in about an hour's time. After I was through phoning I protested against my arrest to both detectives in the presence of about twenty people, and I asked that the case be tried at once, either at Cardinal or at Notre Dame de Lourdes, where the warrant was sworn, and before the justice of the peace who swore it, but this was not of any use, and they searched me, and took all papers and documents they could find. I had on me all the scrutineer's papers for the surrounding district, and I tried to pass them to Mr. Gauthier, but A. C. Ross refused. By this device they had all the organization work crippled up on our side.

From Cardinal we took the train to Somerset, and from Somerset we took the train to Miami, where Detective Ross hired a four-seated buggy and drove us eighteen miles to Morden. Whilst on the way to Morden, Detective Ross used abusive language against the Liberal party and the late Liberal government, and to this I could not reply, only by saying that I would get even for the way I was treated some day.

When we arrived at Morden it was about half-past 6 o'clock that night. I was taken to the jail and locked up in a cell. After a time they offered me something to eat, and when I insisted on having more than bread and water, they brought me some ginger biscuits, which was all I had that night, and I had to pay for them. They then called me up and read the charge, which was for giving \$10 to Paul Fries on Tuesday night to keep him from voting. To this I pleaded not guilty, and the case was remanded till the next day at 4 o'clock p.m., and I was taken back to the cell.

Shortly afterwards I was interviewed by Detective Ross with a list of names which he said were in my book when he took it away from me. Upon the list was the name of Paul Fries, and opposite was a sign—\$10. I told Mr. Ross that I had never seen the list before, and that it was not my writing. He still affirmed that it

was mine, and that I was accused of a very serious charge, and that they had all my books and papers, and that they had very strong evidence against me, but that if I pleaded guilty, I would be let out without any trouble, and nothing would be done against me. Shocked by the impudence of a man that wanted to play with my honour like that, I strongly denied the charge, and I told him that I was not guilty, and that I would wait until I could get justice. That was all that night, but in the morning they started again. The jailer was the first, and on coming to my room he said that I was charged with a most serious offence, and that if I would only consent to plead guilty, they would let me off. I absolutely refused to listen to him. Then came Jack Kennedy, who is a proprietor of one of the hotels there. He also tried to get me to plead guilty, saying that it would be the better way for me, and that I would get off right away, and that he would see that nothing would be done to me, and that if I would not do that, that they would hold me for a long time, and I might get a heavy sentence. Then I was interviewed by Mr. Kennedy again, and by two jailers or detectives, but still I held out. After that, the whole five came in a body, and pleaded with me to give in and say I was guilty. They said that I would get off if I would only say I was guilty, but still I held out.

At 4 o'clock in the afternoon, they again summoned me into the court room, and Magistrate Morden was then present. The charge was read against me, and again I pleaded not guilty. The magistrate said I would have to go back to jail, and the case would be remanded till Thursday at the request of Mr. Bowen, Crown prosecutor. Mr. H. McConnell, the lawyer, then rose, and asked that I should be allowed out on bail. The magistrate refused to allow bail, and Mr. McConnell insisted, but the magistrate was obdurate, and I had to go back to the cell. Some time later I was surprised when the jailer came to the cell, and I was summoned to the court, and asked to sign papers for admission to bail. I was somewhat suspicious at first, as I did not know who were the men who were going to assist me, but I saw that they were anxious to get me at liberty, and so I signed the papers and was released. This was all that happened, and I came home on Monday, and returned to Morden for the trial on Thursday. My case was then heard before Justices Morden and Jicklie. Nobody appeared for the prosecution except Mr. Bowen, the Crown attorney, who asked for a further remand.

The following are Magistrate Morden's words in dismissing the case:—

Before dismissing this case, I would like to say that it is entirely

wrong altogether, either one of two things is true;—this young man should never have been arrested, or the Crown should be in such a position as to go on with the charges which have been laid against him. They are not prepared, and there is only one conclusion to the case, and that is to dismiss it. There has been ample time for the preparation of evidence. The Crown ought, if there were a real case now, to be ready to go and proceed with the trial. There is absolutely no reason for a remand. There is no excuse for this case being carried any further, and I therefore dismiss the case.

Mr. William Manaham, my counsel, asked for a certificate of dismissal, and the magistrate said that he would willingly grant that, and this I received the next day.

The information laid against me, read as follows:—

R. DIXON,

City of Winnipeg,

At Notre Dame de Lourdes.

Tuesday, the 10th day of October, 1912.

I have reason to believe, and doth believe that on Tuesday, the 8th day of October, at Notre Dame de Lourdes, Rosario Prince did give to Paul Fries, of Notre Dame de Lourdes aforesaid, the sum of ten dollars, upon the promise of the said Paul Fries neither to vote nor use his influence in the approaching election in the constituency of Macdonald.

Louis Fouasse,
Justice of the Peace.

(Signed) ROLAND DIXON.

After the case was dismissed, I got back my book and papers and also the scrutineer's certificates which I had before my arrest. In my note book, every page where there were notes or writing, was initialled with the letters 'A. C. R.', which are the initials of A. C. Ross, and the name Paul Fries was indeed in my book, which I had as a reference, but there was no sign of 10 opposite to the name.

(Sgd.) R. J. A. PRINCE.

Jailed for Speech Making.

AFFIDAVIT OF W. B. SIFTON.

Province of Manitoba,

To wit:

In the matter of the McDonald By-election, for the Electoral Division of McDonald, held on the 12th day of October, A.D., 1912.

I, William Blake Sifton, of the Post Office of Mannitonas, in the province of Manitoba, farmer, make oath and say as follows:

1. Prior to the 12th day of October, I had no particular employment to take up my time, and came to Winnipeg, and went to Mr. Richardson's Central Executive, and volunteered my services in connection with the by-election.

2. As I had been a resident of Manitoba for some thirty-three years, of which time I lived for some twenty years on Lake Manitoba, and in the vicinity of St. Laurent; consequently being well acquainted with the people at St. Laurent and vicinity, I was requested by the committee to look after the organization for Mr. Richardson, the independent candidate at that point.

3. On the afternoon of Tuesday, the 8th day of October, I left Winnipeg and went to St. Laurent on the Canadian Northern Railway train, arriving at St. Laurent at 6.25 p.m. or thereabouts. I spent the balance of the evening of the 8th and all-day Wednesday the 9th, and the evening of Wednesday the 9th, visiting my old friends in St. Laurent, whom I have known for twenty years or thereabouts, endeavouring to show those whom I interviewed why they should support the candidature of Mr. Richardson. On Thursday the 10th, I took a team and drove through that portion of the country lying to the northeast of St. Laurent, where I found that a good many of my friends had left the village and homesteaded in the country, and returned to St. Laurent that night.

4. On Friday the 11th, I spent the forenoon in the village, and was about to go to Oak Point, a distance of seven miles farther, which place I had not visited. While I was in the act of stepping aboard the train, my arm was seized by some person in the rear of me. I turned around and saw a party whose name I have since learned was Jarvis, who told me that he was a provincial constable. Jarvis tried to pull me off by force, without having produced a warrant or notifying me that he had one, but I resisted and he was unable to do so. I finally extricated myself from the

grasp of Jarvis. I then jumped off the train to find the reason of my being interfered with, and approached Jarvis and asked for an explanation of his seizing me on the train. He says 'I have a warrant for you' and immediately produced the warrant, and stating at the same time that he was a provincial constable.

5. Another party, whose name I have since learned was Thomas Steadman, of Winnipeg, was standing beside Jarvis at the time the latter grasped me while I was boarding the train, and I heard Steadman tell Jarvis to jerk me off the train. The same party, namely, Steadman, was standing beside Jarvis when I approached the latter demanding an explanation.

6. After the warrant was produced by Jarvis, he, Jarvis, proceeded to read it, and I stated that I would prefer to read it myself, and he handed to me and I perused same, and having perused it handed it back to Jarvis.

7. After I had handed the warrant back to Jarvis, I stated to Jarvis and Steadman that I supposed they were paid tools of the government, to which Steadman replied 'we have the authority.'

8. I then stated to Jarvis that I did not know whether I would pay any attention to the warrant or not, or words to that effect, and he referred me to Steadman who at once stepped along side of me.

9. I said to Steadman, 'I do not know what your name is, but I presume I will find that out later, but I am not going to be searched, and I won't go to jail.' Steadman said to me. 'You are wanted in Winnipeg, you will have to go to Winnipeg.' All this conversation took place on the station platform at St. Laurent.

10. After Steadman said this, he and Jarvis walked off together, and held some private conversation, and then they came back to me, and the three of us entered the station. I knew that the headquarters were depending upon me to look after the interests of Mr. Richardson at this poll on election day, and I therefore felt that it was absolutely necessary to wire them informing them of my arrest, so that they might send some person out on the 4 o'clock train that day to take my place. I went up to the wicket in the station and asked for a telegram pad. The agent handed it to me, and I wrote a telegram out informing the executive that I had been arrested, and asked them to provide for the poll. I took twenty-five cents out of my pocket, and shoved the telegram and the money to the station agent. The station agent picked up the telegram and the money, and turned to send the telegram, but Steadman walked into his private office, and put his hand on his shoulder, and said in my hearing to the station

agent, 'I demand that you shall not send that telegram under my authority as a police officer, this man is under arrest. The station agent handed the money back to me, and I refused to take it, but the station agent said that I might as well, as he could not send the telegram.

11. Steadman, Jarvis and I then went up to the hotel, to my room. I was kept by the constables in my room all that night. They did not let me leave the room at all, and the following morning about 7 o'clock, we left the hotel, the two constables with me, and took the train to Winnipeg. Jarvis accompanied me to Winnipeg, but Steadman remained in St. Laurent.

12. Upon our arrival at Winnipeg, I was taken to the Provincial Police Court, and I was taken into the room of McKenzie, one of the provincial police. McKenzie called Marsh Jackson, another police officer into his room, and upon Jackson entering the room Jarvis was dismissed and left the room, and then McKenzie left the room, leaving me alone with Jackson.

13. I asked Jackson what the charge was, what the reason of my arrest was, and why I was brought to Winnipeg. 'Well,' he says, 'clause 269 of the Election Act is very broad, even a man for making a public speech could be arrested through a certain interpretation of that clause.' I told Jackson that I had done nothing wrong, and I asked him what was the nature of the charge against me, to which he replied. 'Well the nature of the charge is that you were in the constituency of McDonald and influencing voters there.'

Thereupon I became somewhat angry, and said—'Now, look here Mr. Jackson, that is no charge to arrest a man on,' and he replied. 'Look here, we have two sworn affidavits that came in on the train today, that you offered two men \$25.00 apiece for their vote.'

To which I replied, 'Jackson, that is an absolute falsehood, and I don't believe you have them either,' or words to that effect, to which he replied. 'Well these affidavits will not be produced when you are brought before Magistrate McMicken if you plead guilty to the charge laid in the information.' Jackson further told me that I had better plead guilty, because the charges in the information were of a serious nature, and that I could be released provided I went home, and took no further part in the election. Thereupon I said in a laughing way, 'I will certainly plead guilty, because I have certainly been in the constituency of McDonald, influencing voters, for I went there for that purpose.' This ended the conversation.

14. Jarvis then came into the room and took me before Magistrate McMicken, Jackson and McKenzie accompanying us. When I went in before Magistrate McMicken and appeared before him for a considerable time he said nothing to me, apparently being uncertain as to how to proceed, but finally he spoke and said. 'Is this the man with whom we have to deal, the man that was arrested yesterday' looking at me as he said this. I believing that he was addressing me spoke up and said. 'Well I am the man that was arrested yesterday, but I do not know what dealings you have with me.' Thereupon the magistrate turned to the party acting as clerk of the court, and who from the way he talked I would judge to be a foreigner, and asked him to read the information. I was standing near this party, and as he read it I looked over his shoulder and read the information also, and I noticed that I was charged with being in the constituency of Macdonald influencing voters, and also charged with bribery and corruption. After the clerk got through, the magistrate looked at me and said: 'Are you guilty or not guilty?' I replied, 'I am not guilty of bribery and corruption, but I certainly was in the constituency of Macdonald and attempted to influence voters to vote for Mr. Richardson.' The magistrate then said. 'We can remand this case until a later date if you will take the next train and go home and not do any more work in the election.' McKenzie then spoke up and said that he could remand it to a later date if he wished, and that he, McKenzie would be responsible for my appearance. Thereupon Jackson spoke up and said that it would be remanded provided that I took the next train to Dauphin, and did no more work in the elections. I said I could not take the next train to Dauphin, that I had personal business in the town on Monday, and would need to stay here. The magistrate then when he found I could not take the next train to Dauphin, said that I would have to go to jail until the case was decided, but McKenzie spoke up, and said that I need not go to jail, that he would be responsible for my appearance. The magistrate then said. 'We will release you up to Monday at 10.30, upon the condition that you stay in the city, and do not go into Macdonald constituency, and do not work for Mr. Richardson.' I then walked out of the room.

15. Before I left the court room, Jackson told me that I must appear on Monday, and that the elections being over, upon my appearing on that date, I would be given a complete dismissal, and I could then go home.

16. I then saw my solicitor, and on Monday morning in company with my solicitor, I appeared in court. The case was called

and Magistrate McMicken was on the bench. I elected for a trial by jury, and the case was remanded until Saturday.

17. I had lunch that day with a provincial constable from Dauphin, a friend of mine. During our conversation he asked me if I would not like to have that case dismissed. He said 'I think I can arrange to have that dismissed today, I know the people pretty well that run this government.' 'Well' I said, 'if you can get an honorable dismissal, with a regular acquittal, it will be all right; sure I would like to have it.' This gentleman, whose name was Rooke and I then went over to the provincial buildings. I stayed in the outside room while he consulted with Graham, the attorney-general for the province. After about half an hour he returned and took me into Graham's office, and we shook hands, and Graham said, 'Mr. Rooke has stated this to me, and we can arrange that all right, and I will telephone the magistrate, and you fellows go right up there.' We left the building, and went to the Provincial Court on Fort Street in the presence of Magistrate McMicken, and on our way I suggested to Rooke that I consult my solicitor. He said it was not necessary, if we could get this case dismissed with an honorable acquittal, that should be satisfactory. I said 'I will be satisfied if I have an honorable acquittal' and before entering the building we stopped and talked on the street, and I again told him that I had better consult my solicitor, and he said. 'It is not necessary, come on upstairs,' and we met Marsh Jackson and went into his room, and talked there for a minute or two, and then we all went into Magistrate McMicken's room, where I was supposed to get an honorable acquittal. I said to them. 'while I will be glad to get an honorable acquittal, this looks illegal, and I will get either myself or you people or my solicitor in trouble. I think I had better consult my solicitor before anything is done.' The magistrate told me that it was not necessary to consult my solicitor, if I would consent to elect to be tried by him instead of by jury, he would try me and give me an honorable acquittal there and then. I did not know what to do, but I finally consented to elect to be tried by him as he the magistrate suggested. The magistrate then said that he dismissed the case, and wrote something on the information. I then asked for a certificate of dismissal. He said. 'It is not necessary, you are honorably discharged. I have written on this information—on the document, and find no charge against you.' I insisted upon a certificate, he said. 'Can't you trust your friends standing here that this case has been honorably disposed of?' I said 'Your honor, I have a great

many more friends in the country, and I would like to have a piece of paper to show them, undoubtedly they have heard of my arrest.' He got excited, and said that it was not necessary, that the newspapers would come out with headlines, especially the Telegram, showing that I was honorably acquitted. I said. 'That is all that can be done. I am a free man.' He said. 'Yes sir, you are absolutely a free man, go where you will.'

18. I then came immediately and informed my solicitor of what had taken place. He said that I was entitled to that certificate, and he suggested that we return at once to the Police Court, and make another demand for the same, which we did, and two other lawyers. The magistrate was undecided. He said. 'I can't sign this until I confer with other people, and if you come here at 12 o'clock tomorrow, I will tell you what I will do.' We went the next day and he refused point blank to give me a certificate of dismissal.

19. I appeared on Saturday with my solicitor, and demanded a trial, and was told by the magistrate that the matter had been disposed of, and he would not hear it,

Sworn before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 9th day of November, A.D. 1912.

James Auld,

A Notary Public in and for the province of Manitoba.

(Sgd.) W. B. SIFTON.

Shadowed, Arrested and Threatened with Conviction on Perjured Evidence.

AFFIDAVIT OF J. J. SULLIVAN.

Canada,
Province of Manitoba.

To wit:

In the matter of the election of a member for the Electoral District of Macdonald to serve in the House of Commons.

I, John J. Sullivan, of Regina, in the province of Saskatchewan, clerk, do solemnly declare:—

1. At the request of the committee in Winnipeg in charge of the candidature of R. L. Richardson, the reciprocity candidate in the recent election held in the constituency of Macdonald, Manitoba, I came to Winnipeg on Tuesday, October 1st, and went to the offices of the committee, in the chambers of Commerce Building. There I met Mr. Fred. Woodrow, secretary of the Liberal Association, and Mr. J. W. Wilton who had charge of Mr. Richardson's campaign. Mr. Wilton told me that they understood that I had considerable experience in organization work in election campaigns in Saskatchewan, and that they were desirous of enlisting my services for strengthening their organization work. He asked me if I would take charge of the north poll in Carman, and pointed out to me that although there were several willing workers there, they had so far been unable to systematize their organization, and he thought that I would be able to be of considerable assistance to them. He said that it would be my duty to organize the poll and to see that the work was efficiently carried on and that the full vote was got out. I said that I would be very glad to help. I went to Carman on Thursday, October 3, arriving there in the morning. I introduced myself to Mr. Roland North, to whom I was told to report. We went to the Richardson Committee Rooms where I met workers and had a general discussion as to what work had been done and the steps that should be taken to get our work in ship-shape. On the following day, October 4, Sir R. P. Roblin came to Carman. He returned to Winnipeg. In the issue of the Winnipeg "Telegram" published on October 5, appeared an interview with Sir R. P. Roblin, in which he is reported to have said as follows:—

I want to make this further statement, not only to the electors of Macdonald, but also to the people of Manitoba, that in my thirty-one years of public life I never saw a constituency invaded or infested with such a gang of boodlers and political thieves and thugs, as are now wandering around that constituency. . . The gang is from the province of Saskatchewan. That province has sent down apparently the whole boodling and bribing brigade of political thugs, who appear to have been making Saskatchewan their home.

Members of the Saskatchewan legislature are there. Men who cannot put half a dozen sentences together grammatically, nor have any accomplishments that might give dignity or grace to a threshing gang are swarming in the constituency and organizing or endeavouring to organize to debauch and bedevil, as far as they can, the honest, intelligent electors of Macdonald. Carman seems to be the centre. The leader apparently is, as far as I can gather a fellow who is known by the name of Sullen, presumably an alias. . .

I have instructed the provincial police to arrest these men, and they will be placed in jail at the earliest possible moment when they attempt to do the work they have been sent there to do, and I want to say that because a man is an M.P.P. or an ex-M.P.P. in Saskatchewan or of anywhere else, it will not prevent justice being done.

2. I am informed and believe that I was the only worker from Saskatchewan in the said constituency of Macdonald in said election, exclusive of certain gentlemen from Saskatchewan who spoke on public platforms during said election, and among whom were the Hon. George Langley, the Hon. Thomas MacNutt, and R. E. Devlin, M.P.P. I deny that there were any persons from Saskatchewan engaged in organization work in said constituency other than myself.

3. On Friday, October 4, I observed and was informed that I was being shadowed by provincial constables, including Provincial Constable Laughlin. In the evening I attended a public meeting in company with Mr. Roderick MacKenzie, at which he and I spoke in support of Mr. Richardson.

4. On the following Saturday morning I met Mr. Thomas MacNutt, M.P., at the committee rooms. After stopping there a little while, I went out and met Mr. Roland North. As we were going along the street together, we met a person whose name I do not know, and he came along with us. Mr. North spoke to him as to how he was going to vote. He replied that he was a ballot voter, and that nobody knew how he would vote. I asked him to come to our meeting and hear our speakers before deciding which way he would vote. Outside of this party, I did not mention or

discuss politics with anyone in Carman, outside of members of the committee whom I met in the committee rooms. That Saturday afternoon I came down to Winnipeg and went to the General Committee Rooms, where I procured a considerable quantity of campaign literature, polling lists and cartoons and some newspapers.

5. On the way down to Winnipeg I noticed that one of the provincial constables whom I had seen at Carman was on the train, and apparently following me. He subsequently informed me that he was detailed to look after me and that if I had got off at any of the intermediate stations, he would also have got off in order to keep me in sight.

6. I returned to Carman on Monday, October 7. I was met at the hotel by two provincial constables by the names of Hanson and Bertram. Hanson said that he had a warrant for my arrest. I asked him what the charge was. We went to my room and he took out a warrant for my arrest which he read over to me. I do not recollect the exact words that he read, but it was to the effect that I had illegally induced or had attempted to induce a voter to vote at the then pending election. The said constables then placed me under arrest, and took me down to another room in the hotel. While waiting in this room, Mr. Thomas Usher, one of the committee men came to me, and asked me for a list of the voters at Brunkild poll, which I had copied from the only available list at the committee room. I was in the act of handing it to him when I was intercepted by Constable Hanson who seized the paper and refused to allow Mr. Usher to have it. Hanson said to me that I was under arrest, and that he would take all papers. A little later Constable Hanson asked me to show him all papers that I had in my possession. This I did, and he went through them and made a careful examination of them, and finding nothing that he thought was incriminatory, he returned them to me. He also made an examination of my travelling bag. I was then taken to the railway station by Hanson, Bertram and Laughlin, one of them walking on each side of me, and one walking immediately behind.

At the station I was taken on board the train in company of Constables Bertram and Laughlin. We arrived in Winnipeg at about 4 o'clock in the afternoon, when I was taken to the office of Police Magistrate McMicken.

7. There were present at said police office said two constables, Marsh Jackson, who is a provincial constable, and the clerk of the court, and another man whose name I do not know. The charge was read over to me by the clerk. A man whose name I do not know asked to have the case remanded until Saturday, October 12,

at 3 o'clock p.m. The magistrate made a remand in accordance with this request. I was then taken to the provincial jail.

8. On my arrival at the jail I was taken to a room where I was ordered to hand over all effects in my pockets. I emptied my pockets, including private papers, pass books, travelling card and money. The guard then felt all about my person, and ordered me to take off my boots, which he examined to see if there was anything bidden in them.

I was then taken to a cell where I was locked up. During that evening some one came to the cell and laid down on the floor some bread and a cup of tea, and announced that it was my supper. That night after I undressed the guard made me carry my clothes into the corridor where they were placed on a bench in the corridor. He then told me to stand with my face to the wall in the corridor while he made a search of the cell.

9. On the same night that I was brought to Winnipeg, the Hon. Robt. Rogers addressed a meeting at Saint James, Macdonald. A report of his speech appeared in next day's Winnipeg 'Telegram.' He is there reported to have said:

I know we have nearly one hundred thugs from Saskatchewan scattered through this riding. They are in this very polling division, and we are watching them. One of the ringleaders of that gang, a special and personal friend of Mr. Calder, was arrested to-day in the town of Carman.

In the press of Saturday Mr. MacNutt made the statement Mr. Richardson was going to succeed. Mr. MacNutt evidently thought he was in Saskatchewan, because he knew he was surrounded by the thugs which Mr. Roblin had described.

The thug arrested to-day came into the constituency with Mr. MacNutt.

He went to Carman for a week, and registered as Sullivan. He spent his time there for a week, and then came into Winnipeg with Mr. MacNutt. Mr. Sullivan, of Carman, walked down to another hotel in Winnipeg and registered as Sutherland. He was at this hotel on Sunday, and had interviews with Grit election manipulators, and yesterday (Monday) morning, went to Carman again and registered as Sullivan, but the moment he started to operate he was nabbed, and was now behind the bars. There are many others who will follow him.

10. On Tuesday morning some bread and tea were left on the floor of my cell for my breakfast. I refused to take it and demanded some decent food. After some little talk, the guard agreed to get me some breakfast. Some other food was brought me, and for this

I was charged 75 cents, which was kept out of the money which had been taken from me. I then asked that I be allowed to see my lawyer, Mr. Hugh D. Cutler. He saw me, and told me that he was making efforts to get bail for me, but that he had been unable to see the information or warrant under which I had been arrested, though he had made efforts to see them. He also told me that Marsh Jackson had told him that it was no use obtaining my release on bail, for if I were released on this charge, I would be immediately re-arrested on another. All day Wednesday no one came to see me.

11. On Thursday morning, October 10, Charles Forrester and Edward O'Connor, lawyer, came to see me at the jail. They promised that if I would go home that afternoon they would get me off. I said I might as well go home, as I will not be allowed to work, and there is nothing else for me to do. I felt that I had been neglected by my friends and that there was nothing else for me to do but go back to my own Province. After I got out, I found that the case had excited a great deal of interest, and that it would be neither fair to myself nor to the party to allow the matter to end in this way.

12. I was taken from the jail to Mr. Forrester's office, which is in the same building as the Provincial Magistrate's Court. There were present Mr. O'Connor, Constable Bertram, Marsh Jackson and Constable Laughlin. When I left Forrester's office it was upon the understanding that I was to leave for home that evening. I left in company with Constable Bertram, whose name I had then learned was Campbell. We went to a barber's shop. There I picked up a copy of the 'Free Press,' and I saw that a great deal of indignation was being expressed over my treatment. Of this I was ignorant when I was in jail. I also saw a statement in the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' which severely maligned me. I made up my mind that I should remain in the city and have the matter cleared up rather than rest under the imputations caused by my arrest and my treatment in jail. In company with Constable Campbell I went back to Charles Forrester's office, I told him that I had changed my mind, and that I was going to stand my trial for the charge that was laid against me, and that I was prepared to go back to jail. He asked me what had caused me to change my mind. I said that I had seen the papers, and that if I went back the 'Telegram' would have scare headlines that I had left the province because I was guilty and afraid of standing trial.

I then told him that he could send me back to the jail as soon as he was ready, and that that would relieve me of any obligation to him. Forrester tried a number of times to persuade me to leave for home. I refused to go. Provincial Constable Parr was then called

in and took charge of me. We went to the Empire Hotel where we stayed for a night in the same room.

13. On Friday morning in company with Constable Parr I went again to Forrester's office, and I told him that if he would get a certificate of dismissal from the magistrate that I would return to my home on the Canadian Northern railway that evening. Constable Parr and I left and returned in the evening. Forrester said that he thought that I was to leave on the Canadian Northern railway train. I replied that he did not make any arrangement for me to leave on that train. He said: 'When are you going home?' I said, 'I am not going home until I get my dismissal from the magistrate on Saturday.' He replied, 'You are a fool Sullivan, if you do not go home. As sure as you stay here you will be sent down,' and he instanced the case of a man named Chamberlain, I think, who was sent to jail, and who, he said, was no more guilty than I was. I then said, 'I am perfectly innocent of any wrong-doing and you cannot convict me without perjured evidence.' He said, 'We can get perjured witnesses against you,' and that I should remember that the government, the police magistrate and the constables were against me down here, and that I had better get home while I had the chance.

I refused to go without the discharge, and after some time, Mr. Thomas Murray came to Forrester's office to see me. He had a chat with me and told me that O'Connor had seen him, and that O'Connor was very indignant of the way I had acted in the matter. Mr. Murray told me that he was a good Liberal, and that he thought under the circumstances I had better go home. I decided in deference to Mr. Murray's representations that I had better leave. I left that evening for home. I was accompanied as far as Rivers, Manitoba, by Provincial Constable Ross. On the train he told me that he would like to go to his home at Virden. I said he could get off the train at Portage la Prairie, and that he could take my assurance that I would proceed to my home. He said that his instructions were to accompany me to the boundary of the province. He went with me as far as Rivers.

14. In the following week I got word that I should return to Winnipeg as my case was on the docket, and would come up on Saturday morning, October 19, at 10 o'clock. I returned to Winnipeg on October 18, and was instructed to see Mr. Trueman, who was acting for me as my counsel at the hearing of the case. In company with Mr. Trueman I went to the Provincial Police Court on Saturday morning, October 19, at 10 o'clock. I saw the court docket and saw that my case was on the docket to be heard at 10 o'clock. Mr.

Trueman stated to Police Magistrate McMicken that he appeared on my behalf and that we were prepared to proceed with the hearing of the information. The magistrate said that the case had already been disposed of, and he refused to go on with it. Mr. Trueman obtained from the magistrate a paper purporting to be the information laid against me. While Mr. Trueman was reading it, the magistrate demanded it back. Mr. Trueman refused to surrender it until he had an opportunity to make a copy. The magistrate and a number of provincial constables then sought to obtain it by force, and eventually they procured it from him. In the meantime, the magistrate adjourned his court, and no further proceedings have been taken in the case.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of 'The Canadian Evidence Act.'

Declared before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 23rd day of November, A.D. 1912.

Ward Hollands,

JOHN J. SULLIVAN.

A Commissioner in B. R'. &c.

HON. ROBERT ROGERS' DEFENCE.

All these affidavits were read aloud in the House of Commons.

The fact that the Dominion Government was co-operating with Premier Roblin in this Manitoba Reign of Terror was shown in Parliament when Hon. Robert Rogers most reluctantly came to the rescue after the facts of the case had been exposed by Hon. Frank Oliver and repeated and emphasized by other speakers. The Minister of Public Works showed surprising effrontery in his defence. He could not deny the facts, and made no attempt to do so in the cases of Walkinshaw and Prince, but in the other two cases advanced the extraordinary theory that the victims deserved their imprisonment because they were known to be election workers, and one of them was alleged to have bought drinks for half-breeds. This was his excuse for arresting reputable citizens, herding them with criminals in prison on ominous charges, and then when the election was over dismissing them without definite charge, evidence, or trial. If such a theory were permitted to pass unchallenged, Canada would be where England was under James II, and no opposition election worker would be safe from arbitrary arrest, imprisonment and ill-treatment. The significant feature of the debate in parliament is that the Govern-

ment did not deny the facts nor even attempt to excuse them, under these circumstances what guarantee is there that they are not prepared to repeat such outrages?

FREEDOM FOR TORY PERSONATORS.

It was shown that two "workers" for the Government side had been arrested at the instance of Liberals for personating genuine voters at the polls. And what happened to these gentlemen? In the first place they were liberated on easy bail and the day and hour of their trial set. The lawyers for the prosecution attended at the day and time set for the trial, only to discover that the magistrate had held trial in secret an hour or two earlier, and that the personators had pleaded guilty, and were each fined \$50 and costs and given their liberty. The fines and costs were paid by the Conservative party organization so that the penalty became a mere farce.

Tells how Conservative convicted of personation, allowed bail, and given illegal light penalty at secret session of court.

AFFIDAVIT OF BARRISTER HUGH MACKENZIE.

Canada.

Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

In the matter of an election holden on the 12th day of October, A.D., 1912, in the Electoral District of Macdonald in the Province of Manitoba.

I, Hugh Mackenzie of the City of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, Barrister-at-law, do solemnly declare that,—

1. On Saturday the 12th day of October, A.D., 1912, I was present at polling booth in division No. 2 in the Electoral District of McDonald in the province of Manitoba, as the duly appointed agent of Robert Lorne Richardson, candidate in said electoral district at an election held on the said date for the election of a member for said electoral district to serve in the House of Commons.

2. That while polling was in progress a person representing himself as John H. Humphrey made application for a ballot in that name and duly recorded his ballot which was received by the Deputy Returning Officer and deposited in the ballot box. Said person who was unknown to me appeared during the time that Alexander Gunn, Mr. Richardson's local scrutineer, was absent from the polling booth for the purpose of recording his vote in polling subdivision No. 3 in said electoral district. Later in the afternoon the real John H. Humphrey appeared and upon taking the prescribed oath was permitted to record his vote. Upon his appearance in the polling booth he was immediately recognized and greeted by Charles Carr, the poll clerk at said polling booth and a prominent worker in St. James in the Conservative interest. Mr. Carr had been present when the persona-

tor appeared and gave the name of John H. Humphrey but he made no objection to said personator receiving a ballot and casting his vote in said election. The name Humphrey appears only once on the voters' list for said polling division and said Carr always referred to said list before entering the name in the poll book.

3. That the name of Allen W. Craigie is in the correct list of qualified electors entitled to vote in said election in said polling division.

4. During the polling of votes at said election a person whose name and identity were unknown to me but who subsequently was identified to me as one Robert Stout applied in the name of Allen W. Craigie to the Deputy Returning Officer for a ballot saying at the same time that his name was Allen W. Craigie, that he resided on Roseberry Street, and that he was a carpenter by trade.

5. I immediately asked the said applicant a number of questions as to his identity and at the conclusion of his answers thereto the Deputy Returning Officer upon my request placed the said applicant in the custody of the poll constable as a person who had applied for a ballot in the name of Allen W. Craigie but not being said Allen W. Craigie.

6. That immediately upon the detention of said person. I preferred information in writing oath before said Deputy Returning Officer charging said person with the offence of personation.

7. That the Deputy Returning Officer thereupon issued his warrant for the arrest and detention of said person and placed said warrant with the Provincial Constable James Bain, who thereupon took the said accused into custody and placed him in confinement in the jail at St. James in the province of Manitoba.

8. That after the said person had been taken into custody the matter of his arrest was discussed in the polling booth and James W. Hatch of St. James, the duly appointed agent of Alexander Morrison the Conservative Candidate at said election, stated to me that he knew that said person was not Allen W. Craigie although when I was interviewing the said person with a view of ascertaining whether or not he was the person he represented himself to be, the said James W. Hatch took no part in the discussion and did not offer to inform me that said person was not Allen W. Craigie.

9. That on Tuesday, October 15th, I went out to St. James where I saw Chief Constable Bain who informed me that one S. D. Richardson, a Justice of the Peace in and for the province of Manitoba, had on the evening of said 12th day of October, ordered and had caused the release of said accused and had remanded him for trial before Alexander McMichen, Provincial Magistrate at the Provincial Police Court in the City of Winnipeg on Wednesday the 16th day of October at the hour of eleven o'clock in the forenoon of said day.

10. That on said Tuesday, October 15th, at three o'clock in the afternoon in company with W. H. Trueman, my Counsel in connection with the prosecution of said information, I went to the office of the said Provincial police court in the said City of Winnipeg. We there interviewed Felix N. Hryniwiecki, clerk of said Provincial police court, and asked him if the matter of my information against said accused was to come before the Provincial police court at eleven o'clock in the forenoon of the next day. He replied that it was. Mr. Trueman then applied on my behalf for subpoenas for three witnesses who were required to give evidence in connection with said information. Said subpoenas were prepared by said clerk and they commanded the attendance of said witnesses at said Provincial police court at the hour of eleven o'clock on Wednesday the 16th day of October, 1912.

11. That on Wednesday, October 16th, I attended at the said Provincial police court from fifteen minutes to eleven o'clock in the forenoon until about thirty minutes after eleven o'clock in the said forenoon. My counsel, W. H. Trueman came to said police court at eleven o'clock in said forenoon.

12. On my arrival at said police court I was informed by Alexander Gunn, one of the witnesses subpoenaed on my behalf, that the case had been disposed of and I immediately communicated this information to Mr. Trueman upon his arrival at the court house. Said Mr. Trueman and I then spoke to the clerk of said court and told him that we were on hand to proceed with the matter of my said information. The said clerk informed us that according to the records the case had been disposed of. I asked him if he had seen the accused and he replied that he had not. I asked him if the accused had been there that morning and he said he did not know. I asked him if he had any record in the matter and he then produced my written information upon which

was written the following memorandum over the signature of said Alexander McMicken—'Pleaded guilty with extenuating circumstances, fine \$50 and cost.

(Sgd.) A. McMICKEN.

13. When I arrived at said police court the said Alexander McMicken was presiding in said court for the trial of cases. My counsel informed the said Alexander McMicken that he appeared on my behalf in connection with said information and that we were prepared to proceed with the hearing of said charge. The following conversation then ensued between the said Alexander McMicken, the said W. H. Trueman and myself:—

Magistrate McMicken: 'Both defendants have been here already, have been tried and have been heavily fined.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Were Mr. Mackenzie or Mr. Macdonald present?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I don't know whether they were or not.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Did any one appear for them?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'Yes, Mr. Sullivan was there.'

Mr. Trueman: 'What Mr. Sullivan?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'My God, what questions you ask; Mr. Sullivan, the lawyer.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Are you sure he appeared for the prosecution?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I don't know anything about that.'

I then made the statement that Mr. Sullivan was not authorized to appear for me and had no instructions to do so; whereupon Magistrate McMicken said: 'You shut up, you have no business to speak here.'

I said. 'I have a right to speak here as I am the person who swore out the information against the accused.'

Magistrate McMicken again ordered me to shut up and to stop making a noise.

I then asked Magistrate McMicken why the case had been disposed of in my absence and in the absence of my counsel before the time fixed for trial.

Magistrate McMicken again ordered me to shut up, remarking that he would send me somewhere I wouldn't like, and he called several times for a constable. Mr. Trueman again asked Magistrate McMicken if he would give any information regarding the case, to which Magistrate McMicken replied, 'I won't tell you anything.'

Mr. Trueman: 'What was the amount of fine imposed?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I won't answer any questions; the men were fined and fined heavily.'

Mr. Trueman asked several times for the amount of the fine imposed, but was constantly met with refusals for the information.

Mr. Trueman asked why the cases had been proceeded with in the absence of the prosecution, to which Magistrate McMicken replied: 'Now go away and don't bother me. I have a lot of business to do here.'

Mr. Trueman: 'You won't say why you did not wait for the people who laid the information.'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I'm not going to stand for nonsense of this kind in court.'

Mr. Trueman: 'It's not nonsense at all; it's a most serious case.'

Magistrate McMicken: 'You shut up and don't bother me.'

Mr. Trueman: 'You refuse to say anything further about the case?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I don't want to hear you speak any more.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Am I to understand then that you will say nothing further in the matter?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'You can understand what you like, and I can tell you it is not very much. I can tell you that much, that your understanding is not of a very high order.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Well, you are doing nothing to assist me in improving it. What right had you to close the case up without the prosecution being present?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I want to hear no more of this.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Was Mackenzie or Macdonald present at the trial?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I don't know, thete was a lot of people about.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Well, I understand that the reporters were here from 10 o'clock and that they saw nothing of the case going on, and they say there was no case heard in the court here.'

Magistrate McMicken: 'Perhaps they were drunk, I don't know.'

Mr. Trueman: 'In what court was the case tried?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I won't tell you.'

Thereupon Mr. Trueman and I left the court room.

14. Subsequently I returned to the court room and asked Magistrate McMicken if Mr. Sullivan had stated that he, Sullivan, had appeared in my behalf. Magistrate McMicken replied, 'No, no, he said he appeared for the prosecution. Now you get out of here and don't bother me any more.'

I further asked Magistrate McMicken what extenuating circumstances had been urged on behalf of accused, to which Magistrate McMicken replied that Constable Bain had stated that the accused was drunk. I said: 'But Constable Bain told me that he was sober and gave no evidence of having been drinking.' Constable Bain was present and in answer to my request that he confirm my statement, stated that he had made no statement whatever with reference to the accused having been drinking. Magistrate McMicken then said: 'Now you get out of here and don't bother me any more—go to blazes—go to the devil. I won't give you any more information.'

15. At the time of accused's arrest he appeared to be perfectly sober, and there was nothing whatever about his appearance or conduct to suggest that he was drunk or had been drinking.

16. I am informed and verily believe that the said Arthur Sullivan, barrister-at-law, did not tell th !said A. McMicken that he appeared for the prosecution in connection with said case:

17. That on Thursday, the 17th day of October, I went to the provincial police court, and, after stating who I was requested the clerk of the court and Magistrate McMicken to permit me

to make a copy of any record in court in connection with said information, but said clerk and said magistrate refused to permit me to inspect any record or to make a copy thereof, and also refused to permit me to make a copy of said information.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, Chap. 145, Sec. 36.

HUGH MACKENZIE.

Declared before me at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, this 14th day of November, A.D., 1912.

M. A. MACQUEEN,

A Commissioner, &c.

Tells How Conservative Person- ator was Secretly Released After Arrest to Prevent Ven- tilation of Other Charges.

AFFIDAVIT OF RICHARD H. MACDONALD.

Canada.
Province of Saskatchewan,
To wit:

In the matter of an election holden on the 12th day of October, A.D., 1912, in the electoral district of Macdonald in the province of Manitoba.

I, Richard H. Macdonald of the city of Moosejaw in the province of Saskatchewan, Editor, do solemnly declare:—

1. That on Saturday the 12th day of October, A.D., 1912, I was a resident elector in polling division No. 4, Deer Lodge, in the electoral district of Macdonald, in the province of Manitoba, and was the duly appointed agent at that poll of Robert Lorne Richardson, candidate in the said electoral district at an election held on the said date for the election of the member for the said electoral district to serve in the House of Commons.
2. That while the polling was in progress I was cautioned by Mr. Richardson's outside scrutineers that there had been several cases of attempted personation of persons well known to them but that in each case when challenged the said persons had gone away without attempting to enter the polling booth and in consequence of such information I was watching for attempts to personate absentee voters.
3. During the afternoon while polling was in progress a person representing himself as a voter named 'Quinn' entered the polling booth and applied for a ballot. The said person was unknown to me but was not either of the Quinns on the list of voters at that poll, one of whom had already voted and the other, Valentine G. Quinn being a banker who resided in Douglas Park, within a few

hundred yards of my residence, and who had, to my knowledge, left for the Coast for some considerable period and I knew that he had not returned to the electoral district or vicinity. I immediately asked that the said person should be sworn and the deputy returning officer, Mr. Cotter, asked him what number his name was on the list, to which he replied 'they told me 196.' The Deputy Returning officer immediately said: 'You are not Valentine G. Quinn; what is your name?' to which the said person replied 'I ought to know my own name.' Again asked what his name was he answered 'Quinn' and stated he had a brother outside and attempted to leave the polling booth under the pretence of fetching the said brother in, but was prevented by the constable at the door, under instructions from the deputy returning officer, to whom I stated that I wished the man arrested.

4. Valentine G. Quinn was a name appearing on the corrected list of qualified voters entitled to vote at the said election in the said polling division and I demanded from the person giving his name, who he was, to which he persisted in replying 'my name is Quinn.' I again asked that he be arrested, to which the deputy returning officer replied 'wait a minute, perhaps there is another Quinn on the list.' Whereupon I pointed out that there was, and that the said Quinn had already appeared and voted and had been recognized by those present.

5. In reply to further questioning the person representing himself as Valentine G. Quinn admitted to me that his name was 'Tom Morris' and that he did not reside in the polling subdivision of the electoral district, but that he resided at No. 303 Ellen Street in the city of Winnipeg.

6. Thinking that the deputy returning officer was not going to arrest the man I left the polling booth for a few minutes and requested a justice of the peace, who was outside, to hold himself in readiness to receive from me an information which I was then preparing and to arrest and to have arrested a person then within the polling booth.

7. On my return both the deputy returning officer and Mr. Johnstone, the agent of Alexander Morrison, the Conservative candidate pleaded with me not to have the man arrested. The deputy returning officer stated that I could easily trace him afterwards. I pointed out that I had no guarantee that the address

given was a correct one and the alleged Tom Morris then threw over to me a brass check marked on one side 'B. & C.' and 'L.T.D.' and on the other side the number '139,' and stated that he was employed by the firm who were laying asphalt on the road running past the polling booth and that this was his time check. He was pleading that I would let him go as he said he had a wife and three children dependent upon him.

8. On Monday the 14th day of October, A.D., 1912, I proceeded to the address 303 Ellen Street in the city of Winnipeg, given by the said Tom Morris, and there learned from the land-lady that such a person had been lodging there at one time but had left, owing her rent, a month previously. She identified the said Tom Morris from my description and stated that he had a wife with him but no children and that doth were disreputable characters, the man only working a few days at a time in order to purchase drink.

9. One of the objections raised in the polling booth by Mr. Johnstone, the Conservative scrutineer, to my swearing the information against Tom Morris, was that the magistrate before whom he would be brought, would, he said, have no alternative but to send the man to prison and as he was only a tool in the hands of other people this would punish him too severely. On my insisting, however, the deputy returning officer accepted the information and ordered the said Tom Morris to be conveyed to the St. James police station in the custody of a constable named Ferguson.

10. I subsequently verified from the poll clerk's registrar his entry, which read as follows: 'No. Valentine G. Quinn' and in the remarks column 'Tom Morris attempted personation.'

11. On Monday, October 14th, I went to the residence of Chief Constable Bain, who informed me that Morris had been released by Mr. S. D. Richardson, a justice of the peace in and for the Province of Manitoba on his own recognizance of \$250.00, at about eight o'clock on the evening of October 12th,—and that the said Richardson, who was known to me personally as the man who was in charge of the Conservative campaign in that portion of the electoral district of Macdonald, had remanded the accused for trial on Wednesday, October 16th, but that he was no sure whether the case would be tried at St. Charles or at

the provincial police court. Bain also informed me that it would be his duty to instruct me at what time and place the accused would be tried, in order that I might be present to prefer my charge.

12. On Tuesday, October 15th, 1912, I met the said chief constable Bain on a street car in St. James and he informed me that the case had been set for hearing by Magistrate McMicken at 11 o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday, October 16th, 1912, and I stated that I would be present.

13. On Wednesday, October 16th, 1912, I waited at the said provincial police court from twenty minutes to 11 o'clock in the forenoon until thirty minutes after 11 o'clock in the said forenoon and that on my arrival there I met a reporter from the 'Free Press' named James Fairlie, who had left me to go to the court a few minutes before 10 o'clock in the forenoon and the said Fairlie then informed me that the case had been disposed of before I arrived.

14. That Mr. Alexander Gunn, a witness subpoenaed in a similar case was then in the magistrate's room arguing with some one about the cases and that he came out and very indignantly informed me that the magistrate's clerk had stated that the election cases were disposed of already but that he did not know at what time.

15. That my counsel, W. H. Trueman, arrived a few minutes to 11 o'clock and I at once informed him of what I had learned, and that I also saw Mr. Hugh MacKenzie, a barrister-at-law, and the prosecutor in a similar case against one Stout, and discussed the matter with him.

16. That I have seen the affidavit made by the said Hugh MacKenzie and have read his account of the subsequent proceedings in court as set forth in paragraph 13 thereof, and that I solemnly declare that the same is substantially an exact statement of what took place,

17. That I verily believe and declare that the corrupt motive which induced Alexander McMicken, the provincial magistrate at the said court to dispose of the cases in the way that he did was to prevent the two defendants, Stout and Morris, from appearing in court and there being recognized as having personated other voters in addition to the charges already made against them, and that from

information received I believe that I should have recognized the said defendant prosecuted by MacKenzie as having been a voter in another name at poll No. 4.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me this 25th day of November, A.D. 1912, at the city of Moosejaw, in the province of Saskatchewan.

E. A. St. James.

RICHARD H. McDONALD.

A Commissioner for oaths in and for the province of Saskatchewan.

These were the practices which Premier Borden on the night of Tuesday, Dec. 3rd, 1912, rallied all his forces to endorse at the conclusion of the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER PROTESTS.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier lost no time after the opening of Parliament to express his indignation and that of all Liberals at the manner in which the by-elections in Macdonald and Richelieu had been conducted by the Borden forces. On Monday, November 25th, he moved the following amendment to the Address:—

“We beg to represent to your Royal Highness that in the elections of Macdonald and Richelieu there were practices calculated to terrorize and corrupt the electorate, which were connived at by your Ministers and which deserve the censure of the House.”

Day after day the carnival of terrorism and corruption which marked these two elections was discussed, although it was noted that many of the leaders of the government side avoided the subject as far as possible.

TORIES ENDORSE ROGERS.

Every Member on Government side votes to approve Macdonald atrocities.

Finally, late on the night of December 3rd, the division was called. The word had gone forth that every government supporter, straight Conservative or Nationalist, must combine to vote down the amendment, and thus express his approval of the Macdonald atrocities. They responded and defeated the plea for clean elections and fair play to election workers by a straight party vote of 119 to 71—a majority of 48 in favor of intimidation and bribery.

Following are the Liberals who supported Sir Wilfrid's protest:—

Messieurs:

Béland,	Devlin,	Lemieux,	Pacaud,
Boivin,	Douglas,	Loggie,	Papineau,
Bourassa,	Emmerson,	Lovell,	Pardee,
Brouillard,	Ethier,	Macdonald,	Proulx,
Brown,	Fortier,	Maclean (Halifax),	Reid, (Restigouche).
Buchanan,	Gauthier	MacNutt,	Richards,
Cardin,	(St. Hyacinthe),	McCraney,	Robb,
Carroll,	Gauvreau,	McCoig,	Ross,
Carvell,	German,	McCrea,	Seguin,
Cash,	Graham,	McKenzie,	Sinclair,
Champagne,	Guthrie,	Marcil,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Kay,	(Bonaventure),	(Qu'Appelle),
Chisholm, (Antigonish),	Kyte,	Marcile (Bagot),	Tobin,
Chisholm, (Inverness),	Lachance,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),	Turgeon, Turriff,
Clark, (Red Deer),	Lanctot,	Michaude,	Verville,
Cruise,	Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),	Murphy,	Warnock,
Delisle,	Laurier	Nesbitt,	White (Victoria), Alta) and
Demers,	(Sir Wilfrid), Law,	Neely, Oliver,	Wilson (Laval)

71—

THE FRIENDS OF INTIMIDATION.

And this is the list of dishonor, the men who at the crack of the party whip voted to approve the most brazen election misconduct known in Canada since Confederation:—

Messieurs:

Achim,	Clark (Bruce),	Jameson,	Rhodes,
Aitkins,	Clarke	Kemp,	Robidoux,
Ames,	(Wellington),	Lalor,	Roche,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Clements,	Lamarche,	Rogers,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Cochrane,	Lancaster,	Schaffner,
Arthurs,	Cockshutt,	Lavallée,	Sevigny,
Baker,	Coderre,	L'Esperance,	Sexsmith,
Ball,	Cromwell,	Lewis,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Barker,	Crothers,	Macdonell,	Sharpe (Ontario)
Barnard,	Currie,	McCurdy,	Shepherd,
Barrette,	Davidson,	McKay,	Smith,
Beattie,	Doherty,	McLean,	Smyth,
Bellemare,	Donnelly,	(Queen's P.E.I.)	Stanfield,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Edwards,	Meighen,	Steele,
Best,	Elliot,	Merner,	Stevens,
Blain,	Fisher,	Mondou,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Blondin,	Foster,	Morphy,	Stewart (Lunenburg)
Borden,	(King's, N. S.),	Morrison,	Sutherland,
Boulay,	Foster (Toronto,	Munson,	Taylor,
Bowman,	N.),		
Boyce,	Fowler,	Nantel,	Thoburn,
Boys,	Fripp,	Nicholson,	Thornton,
Brabazon,	Garland,	Nickle,	Tremain,
Bradbury,	Gauthier	Northrup,	Walker,
Broder,	(Gaspé),	Osler	Wallace,
Burnham,	Girard,	(Sir Edmund),	Webster,
	Green,	Paquet,	Weichel,
	Guilbault,	Paul,	White (Leeds),
	Hartt,	Pelletier,	White (Renfrew)

Burrell,	Henderson,	Perley,	Wilcox,
Carrick,	Hepburn,	Porter,	Wilson,
Chabot,	Hughes	Rainville,	(Wentworth) and
Clare,	(Victoria, O.),	Reid (Grenville)	Wright.—119.

~~SYNOD DEPLORES OUTRAGES.~~

MANITOBA PRESBYTERIANS CONDEMN PROSTITUTION OF JUSTICE.

That the outrageous manner in which the Rogers-Roblin combination dominated officials and courts of justice (so-called) in an effort to intimidate and punish all opponents of the Conservative candidate was well known is proven by the fact that such a cautious body as the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Manitoba, sitting at Brandon on September 14th, passed the following severe resolution:

“UNDER A PAINFUL SENSE OF DUTY, THIS SYNOD DEEPLY DEPLORES RECENT EVIDENCE OF THE DELIBERATE PROSTITUTION OF JUSTICE TO PERSONAL OR PARTY ENDS, AND THE TRAMPLING UNDER FOOT THE SACRED RIGHTS OF CITIZENS TO INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AND FAIR TRIAL.”

WINNIPEG CITIZENS ANGRY.

And on Friday, November 22nd a mass meeting of citizens at Winnipeg—the centre of Manitoba Toryism passed the following scathing denunciation:—

(RESOLVED) “THAT THE CANADIAN CITIZENS HERE ASSEMBLED REGARD WITH ABHORRENCE AND ALARM THE CONDUCT OF THE MANITOBA AUTHORITIES CHARGED WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, IN ARRESTING, BY EXECUTIVE ORDER, BRITISH CITIZENS, HOLDING THEM IN PRISON BY REFUSAL OF BAIL, AND FINALLY ABANDONING THE CASE WITHOUT THE PREFERMENT OF CHARGES TO WHICH THEY MIGHT MAKE ANSWER ACCORDING TO LAW.

"THAT THIS ACTION, FOR WHICH THE PRIME MINISTER AND GOVERNMENT OF THIS PROVINCE ARE RESPONSIBLE, WAS SUBVERSIVE OF FREEDOM, WAS AN EXERCISE OF ABSOLUTISM REPUGNANT TO THE LETTER AND THE SPIRIT OF THE BRITISH LAW, AND CONSTITUTED SUCH AN OFFENCE AGAINST THE LAWFUL RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AS TO IMPOSE UPON THE PEOPLE AS THEIR FIRST DUTY THE OBLIGATION OF VINDICATING THE LAW AND RE-ESTABLISHING IN THIS PROVINCE THE LIBERTY OF THE SUBJECT."

The Presbyterian Church of Manitoba and the citizens of Winnipeg have formally recorded their alarm and abhorrence at the crimes of the Rogers-Roblin cabal in the Macdonald by-election.

What are the people of Canada going to do to preserve the liberties won for them by the Liberals in the past from such violent Tory aggression?

2000